

Technical Report 1048

# Interim Report on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions During the 28th Sinai Deployment

**Laurel W. Oliver, Stephanie M. Hayes,  
and Ronald B. Tiggle**

U.S. Army Research Institute

**September 1996**

19961211 051

DATA QUALITY INSPECTED



**United States Army Research Institute  
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

# **U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**A Field Operating Agency Under the Jurisdiction  
of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel**

**EDGAR M. JOHNSON**  
**Director**

---

Technical review by

Joseph Hagman  
Joan Harman

## **NOTICES**

**DISTRIBUTION:** Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to : U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-STP, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

**FINAL DISPOSITION:** This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

**NOTE:** The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE 1996, September		2. REPORT TYPE Interim		3. DATES COVERED (from . . . to) May 1995-June 1996			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  Interim Report on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions During the 28th Sinai Deployment			5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER  5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 0602785A				
6. AUTHOR(S)  Laurel W. Oliver, Stephanie M. Hayes, and Ronald B. Tiggle			5c. PROJECT NUMBER A790 5d. TASK NUMBER 1311 5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER H01				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences ATTN: PERI-RP 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER				
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600			10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI 11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 1048				
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.							
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES							
14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words):  This report documents the during-deployment status of soldiers serving in the 28th deployment to the Sinai, a peacekeeping operation that comprised troops from the Reserve Component (RC) as well as the Active Component (AC). During deployment, 412 soldiers completed survey developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences that contained demographic and attitudinal variables similar to ones in surveys administered before the deployment. Means for all soldiers and for all subgroups dropped on most variables from before the deployment to during the deployment, indicating less positive attitudes at the latter point in time. We found substantial declines during this period on the variables of willingness to volunteer for future similar missions, benefit to military career, improvement in physical health, and willingness to stay in the Army. The steepest decline occurred in how soldiers felt about being in the Sinai. We also found that the actual taking of courses for credit fell far below the level soldiers had expected before they deployed.							
15. SUBJECT TERMS  Peacekeeping      Reserve Component      Active Component      Life course effects      Organizational commitment Career intentions      Educational aspirations      Marital satisfaction      Spouse support      Job satisfaction							
16. REPORT Unclassified			17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	20. NUMBER OF PAGES 34	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Name and Telephone Number)

**Technical Report 1048**

**Interim Report on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions  
During the 28th Sinai Deployment**

**Laurel W. Oliver, Stephanie M. Hayes, and Ronald B. Tiggle**  
U.S. Army Research Institute

**Organization and Personnel Resources Research Unit  
Ruth H. Phelps, MFO Task Force**

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel  
Department of the Army

**September 1996**

---

**Army Project Number  
20262785A790**

**Personnel Systems and  
Performance Technology**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

## FOREWORD

---

In compliance with the Camp David Accords of 1987 and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty protocol of 1981, the U.S. Army has participated in a Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Desert. Traditionally, this participation has involved a 6-month rotational deployment of a battalion-sized Active Component (AC) infantry unit. Recently, however, a composite battalion of AC and Reserve Component (RC) soldiers was deployed, with the latter coming primarily from the Army National Guard's 29th Infantry Division (Light). The purpose of this rotation was to evaluate the ability of AC and RC soldiers to blend into a military unit capable of effectively performing a real-world mission and thereby determine if the concept should be continued or not. An earlier report documented pre-deployment research on respondents' reasons for volunteering and anticipated effects on various aspects of their lives. This report contains mid-deployment research findings concerning effects of the deployment on various aspects of the soldiers' lives.

The research was conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Organization Personnel Resources Research Unit (OPRRU) under work package 6952, "Multinational Force and Observers (MFO): Rotation #28," which is organized under the "Manpower and Personnel" program area.

The Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel sponsored this research. Results have been presented to Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Chief and Vice Chief of Staff of the Army; Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel; Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans; Chief, National Guard Bureau; Director, Army National Guard; Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Forces Command; and Deputy Chief, Army Reserve.

ZITA M. SIMUTIS  
Deputy Director  
(Science and Technology)

EDGAR M. JOHNSON  
Director

INTERIM REPORT ON DEPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS DURING THE  
28TH SINAI DEPLOYMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

This report continues the documentation of some of the research conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) on soldiers participating in the 28th deployment to the Sinai. An earlier report (Oliver, Tiggle, & Hayes, *in press*) contained the before-deployment findings on respondents' reasons for volunteering, expectations for effects on various aspects of their lives, and their present status.

Procedure:

The sample for this research comprised 412 soldiers who completed a usable during-deployment survey that was administered in the Sinai in May 1995. The present research concerns during-deployment data on essentially the same variables covered in the earlier before-deployment report (Oliver et al., *in press*).

Findings:

In general, soldiers were much less positive about some aspects of the deployment than they were before deploying. This phenomenon often occurs with soldiers when their initial enthusiasm for a new Army experience diminishes. However, we found some of the declines in positive perceptions and attitudes to be more marked than we would have expected. For example, soldiers went from very positive expectations about willingness to volunteer for similar assignments in the future to much more negative views on future volunteering. A steep decline also occurred in soldier ratings on how they felt about being in the Sinai. In addition, although a large percentage (82%) of soldiers had anticipated taking courses while in the Sinai, only a little over half of them actually reported taking such courses.

Utilization of Findings:

The findings from this research can help Army managers in planning for future peacekeeping deployments. The more negative responses obtained during deployment may reflect unrealistic expectations by both employees and the Army.

INTERIM REPORT ON EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS DURING THE  
28TH SINAI DEPLOYMENT

CONTENTS

---

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background .....	1
Purpose .....	1
Research Questions .....	1
METHOD .....	2
Sample .....	2
Measures .....	2
Procedure .....	4
Analyses .....	4
RESULTS .....	4
Perceived Effects of Deployment on Life Aspects .....	4
During-Deployment Attitudes .....	5
During-Deployment Career and Education Effects .....	6
DISCUSSION .....	7
Specific perceived Effects .....	7
During-Deployment Attitudes .....	8
During-Deployment Career and Education Effects .....	9
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	10
REFERENCES .....	17
APPENDIX A. DECISION RULES FOR MISMARKED ANSWER SHEETS AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER CONFLICTS .....	A-1
B. OPINIONS ABOUT THE SINAI DEPLOYMENT .....	B-1

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
Table 1. During-Deployment Effects for All Soldiers by Component .....	11
2. During-Deployment Effects by Rank .....	12
3. During-Deployment Attitudes for All Soldiers and by Component .....	13
4. During-Deployment Attitudes by Rank .....	24
5. During-Deployment Career and Education by Component ..	15
6. During-Deployment Career and Education Effects by Rank .....	16

Interim Report on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions  
During the 28th Sinai Deployment

Introduction

Background

The United States Army has provided troops for peacekeeping operations in the Sinai since 1981. For the 28th deployment to the Sinai (January-July, 1995), these troops were primarily from the Reserve Component (RC) rather than the Active Component (AC). The Army Research Institute (ARI) has conducted research which tracked the deployment of the battalion serving in this peacekeeping operation. An earlier report (Oliver, Tiggle, & Hayes, in press) documented the before-deployment status of the members of the battalion on selected variables.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is twofold: (1) to present data on the during-deployment status of the battalion members, and (2) to compare the during-deployment results with those of the before-deployment findings.

Research Questions

The questions to be explored in this report are:

1. Current effects of deployment on soldiers' lives. At this during-deployment time, what effects do soldiers perceive the deployment has had on various aspects of their lives? The specific aspects of their lives we asked about were:

- physical health
- emotional well-being
- civilian job/career
- military career
- marriage
- adjustment to spouse upon return
- children
- likelihood of volunteering for future operations
- likelihood of remaining in military

2. During-deployment status. At this point during the deployment, what are soldiers' perceptions of organizational commitment, career intentions, and educational aspirations?

3. Comparison with before-deployment status. How do the effects anticipated by the soldiers before deployment compare with the effects they reported during deployment? These effects include the specific aspects outlined above.

## Method

### Sample

The sample for this research comprised 412 soldiers who completed a during-deployment survey. Of these, 270 identified themselves as RC soldiers (194 enlisted, 76 officers) and 65 as AC soldiers (7 enlisted, 58 officers). The RC soldiers were from Army National Guard (ARNG) units and from the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR).

Some cases were removed from the data analysis. Examination of the answer sheets revealed that some respondents had completed the surveys with patterned responses (e.g., the first column marked "A," second column "B," etc.; all one response category throughout the survey; alternating responses between two categories such as "A" and "B"). We formulated decision rules, and all surveys failing to meet our inclusion criteria were dropped from the analysis. We removed 28 cases as a result of this procedure.<sup>1</sup>

In some cases, social security numbers did not match. That is, the Army provided a list of names and social security numbers for employees; but these numbers did not always match the number a respondent gave on the before-deployment survey and/or the number given on the during-deployment survey. Again, we formulated decision rules and used them to determine which social security number to use for matching before- and during-deployment responses. Appendix A contains the two sets of decision rules we used in resolving these anomalies.

### Measures

In May 1995, ARI personnel administered several surveys to soldiers deployed to the Sinai. The findings reported here are from the "Opinions about the Sinai Deployment" survey. Appendix B contains a copy of this instrument.

Most of the items in the "Opinions" survey were contained in the "Background and Training" questionnaire administered at Fort Bragg before deployment. Three items were added for this during-deployment data collection. All variables analyzed for this report are described below.

Expected effects of Sinai deployment. Previous research (e.g., Card, 1983; Ivie, Gimbel, & Elder, 1991) has shown that life course events such as military service have long-term as

---

<sup>1</sup>Excluding the improperly marked answer sheets made no substantive difference in the results.

well as short-term effects on people's lives. To tap into some of these changes, survey respondents were asked to rate the anticipated effects of the deployment on various aspects of life, such as physical health, civilian job/career, marriage, and children. The soldiers responded to anticipated change in each life aspect by checking a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree or a Not Applicable option. This effects variable comprises items 24-32 on page 3 of the Opinions questionnaire administered in the Sinai in May 1995 (see Appendix B).

Organizational commitment. The commitment variable was operationalized in a 15-item scale based on the Meyer and Allen (1984; Allen & Meyer, 1990) measure of organizational commitment. The Meyer and Allen instrument was modified by substituting "the military" for "my organization" and deleting one item which did not apply to the military. We also reworded reverse-coded items so that all items read in a positive direction. We used two of the three subscales that Meyer and Allen identified in their instrument.<sup>2</sup> These two scales were: affective commitment, which taps the emotional attachment the respondent feels for the organization, and continuance commitment, which assesses the costs to the person of leaving the organization.<sup>3</sup> The respondent rates each item on a 5-point Likert scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. This variable comprises the items on page 2 of the Opinions questionnaire (Appendix B).

Career intentions. Intentions concerning making a career in the military were measured on a 6-point scale representing the length of time the respondent expected to remain in the military. The career intentions item is No. 1 on page 1 of the Opinions questionnaire (Appendix B).

Educational courses/travel. Two items related to the respondent's educational and travel aspirations. One asked whether the respondent had taken courses while in the Sinai. The other asked whether the respondent had traveled outside the Sinai during the deployment. These items are No. 4 and No. 5 on page 1 of the Opinions questionnaire (Appendix B).

Additional items. Three items were added for the present survey. The additional items related to civilian job satisfaction, military job satisfaction, and the respondent's

---

<sup>2</sup>We are not using a third subscale, normative commitment, as it is not relevant for our purposes.

<sup>3</sup>Teplitzky (1991) used the Meyer and Allen (1984) affective dimension in her measure of organizational identification, substituting "the Army" for "my organization." Teplitzky used reverse coding for four of the seven items in her scale.

expectations concerning the effect of the deployment on an RC soldier's chances of going into the Regular Army. The measures of job satisfaction were based on research in the industrial/organizational psychology literature (e.g., Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis, & Cammann, 1982). Comments from soldiers and interviews with their wives (conducted by other researchers) led to the inclusion of the item concerning soldier expectations of getting into the Regular Army as a result of participating in the deployment. These items are No. 2 and No. 3 on page 1 and No. 23 on page 3 of the Opinions questionnaire (Appendix B).

### Procedure

ARI researchers administered the Opinions questionnaire (plus other instruments) to groups of soldiers in the Sinai during May 1995. The procedure was similar to that followed in data collections conducted at Fort Bragg in 1994 before soldiers deployed (Oliver et al., in press).

### Analyses

The analyses for the research reported here involve during-deployment data. Results are generally reported for the entire sample. Where appropriate and of interest, results are broken out by component (RC and AC) or by rank (junior enlisted, NCOS, and officers). We also present some comparisons of data collected before and during the deployment.

We tested component and rank differences using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. For rank comparisons, which involved three groups, we used Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference technique to test for significant differences. As we did in our before-deployment report, we remind the reader that (1) statistically significant differences are not necessarily substantive ones and (2) these comparisons involved a considerable number of tests based on a limited number of people.

### Results

#### Perceived Effects of Deployment on Life Aspects

Before they deployed, soldiers were asked to indicate how they expected various aspects of their lives to change as a result of the deployment to the Sinai. During the May 1995 data collection (reported here), soldiers were asked what those same effects were at this later point in time. Table 1 contains means and standard deviations for soldier perceptions of deployment effects on various aspects of their lives for the entire sample and by component. Note that the means are based on a 5-point scale.

The pattern of effects as perceived by the RC and AC soldiers during the deployment was very similar. The perceived effects related to marriage, adjustment upon return, and children was essentially the same at both points in time (before-deployment and during-deployment) for both the RC and AC. However, the means on the other effects were generally lower for both component groups than they had been before deployment. The largest change in means from before deployment to during deployment was in the soldiers' willingness to volunteer for future similar operations. The overall mean for this effect fell from 3.91 to 2.63. Willingness to stay in the Army also dropped from 3.96 to 3.13. Another sizable drop occurred in effects of the deployment on physical health (from 4.50 to 3.58) and on military career (from 4.39 to 3.47). Sizable declines on these variables occurred for both components.

Table 1 shows that the component pattern for perceived effects during deployment was very similar to the one we had noted in the before-deployment data for expected effects. Before deployment, RC soldiers tended to rate the various effects more positively than did AC soldiers. During deployment RC and AC ratings tended to be more alike, although there were significant differences on several variables: Mean ratings for military career effects were 3.63 and 2.91 for the RC and AC groups respectively. On the future volunteering item, the means were 2.81 for the RC and 1.99 for the AC. Much smaller but still significant differences occurred on physical health and on staying in the Army, with RC respondents rating these effects more positively.

As can be seen in Table 2, differences among ranks tended to be small even when statistically significant. The largest rank difference was for the adjustment variable. Officers were more positive (mean = 4.19) that their adjustment upon returning home would be quick than were NCOs (mean = 3.53) or junior enlisted personnel (mean = 3.14). Junior enlisted respondents perceived more positive effects on their military careers than the other two rank groups and also were more willing to volunteer in the future. Although statistically significant, these differences were rather small.

#### During-Deployment Attitudes

This section deals with during-deployment attitudes related to organizational commitment, how soldiers felt about being in the Sinai, and job satisfaction. Table 3 contains means and standard deviations for these variables for the entire sample and by component, and Table 4 contains similar data for the three rank groups. As in Tables 1 and 2, these means are based on a 5-point scale.

Organizational commitment. Before deployment, the means for affective and continuance commitment were very close across both components and ranks. The officer mean of 3.77 on affective commitment did differ significantly from NCOs and enlisted personnel although both of these groups had only a slightly lower mean of 3.46. In contrast to the before-deployment finding of no significant difference between components on organizational commitment, Table 3 shows that the AC soldiers were significantly higher on both affective commitment and continuance commitment than were the RC soldiers during deployment. The data in Table 4 reveal that the higher means of officers and NCOs (3.48 and 3.16, respectively) on affective commitment differed significantly from the much lower junior enlisted mean of 2.93 but not from each other. On continuance commitment, the during-deployment data repeat the before-deployment pattern of no significant rank group differences.

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was not measured before deployment, so we cannot compare perceptions of either military job satisfaction or civilian job satisfaction over time. In accordance with the typical pattern, officers reported significantly higher military job satisfaction than did enlisted personnel (a 3.89 mean rating for officers, with means of 2.97 for junior enlisted and 2.95 for NCOs).

Being in Sinai. There was a steep decline in attitudes toward being in the Sinai. Overall ratings on this variable fell from 4.69 to 3.01. Before deployment, we found no significant component or rank differences. During deployment, we found no component differences; but officers were significantly more positive about how they felt about being in the Sinai than were the other rank groups. The mean rating for officers at this later time was 3.89 vs. 2.94 for junior enlisted and 2.93 for NCOs.

#### During-Deployment Career and Education Effects

Tables 5 and 6 contain data relating to career and education effects perceived by the respondents during deployment. For these nominal variables, the data are presented in terms of percentages.

Career intentions. The pattern of during-deployment career intent shifted somewhat from the before-deployment pattern. Although the percentage of undecideds remained about the same, a larger proportion of all soldiers (21%) intended to retire before 20 years than they had before deployment (12%). A somewhat smaller percentage of the entire sample (45%) intended to stay until or beyond 20 years than had before deployment (56%). We found a similar pattern across components and across rank groups.

Deployment effects on careers. There were differences among groups in assessing the effect of the deployment on their careers. Less than a third (29%) of the AC soldiers felt the deployment was good for their careers, and close to half (43%) felt it was not good for their careers. The RC, on the other hand, were more positive about the deployment's effect on their military careers: 63% felt it was good, and 14% felt it was not good for their careers. For rank groups, more junior enlisted rated the deployment as good for their careers (64%) than did either NCOs (41%) or officers (46%).

Getting into Regular Army. The item asking about the effect of the deployment on an RC soldier's chances of getting into the Regular Army was not administered before deployment, so we cannot make any comparisons over time for this item. More than half (56%) the entire sample reported that they didn't know what effect the deployment would have. Table 5 shows that almost twice the proportion of the RC (37%) than AC (19%) believed that the deployment would either increase a soldier's chances or definitely allow the soldier to get into the Regular Army. As can be seen in Table 6, the proportion of junior enlisted expressing this opinion was larger (39%) than either NCOs (28%) or officers (15%).

Education and travel. The proportion of soldiers who reported taking educational courses and traveling during deployment was less than the proportion planning to do so before deployment. Of the 82% of soldiers who had previously planned to take courses, only 53% reported having done so during the deployment. Although the decrease was sharp, the percentage of decline was roughly equivalent across both components and rank groups. Of the 95% of the entire sample who had expected to travel, 88% reported having actually done so.

## Discussion

### Specific Perceived Effects

In general, the deployment effects soldiers reported for various aspects of their lives were less positive than those they had anticipated before the deployment. This finding is a common phenomenon--soldiers just beginning a new Army experience (deployment, new unit, etc.) tend to be enthusiastic and positive. The initial enthusiasm, however, usually wanes as time goes on and reality sets in. ARI research in a variety of areas has demonstrated this phenomenon repeatedly. Hence we consider the overall drop from before to during the deployment an expected result.

But we did note declines which seemed more marked than we would expect for some of the effects. For example, there were much lower means during the deployment for willingness to

volunteer for similar assignments in the future and for willingness to stay in the Army. These perceptions may have implications for future retention. We note, however, that affective organizational commitment--which did decrease--did not drop as sharply. Perhaps this result can be clarified in future research.

Perceptions of physical health were much less positive than soldiers had expected before deployment. We speculate that perhaps expectations for physical activity and exercise were not met in the actual deployment situation. Again, this finding needs to be checked against interview and/or comments data.

As we found before deployment, RC respondents reported more positive deployment effects on outcomes related to their military careers than did AC soldiers. We believe the more positive perceptions of RC soldiers of such effects may be related to their volunteer status. Because they had chosen to go on the deployment, the deployment must have had positive effects for them. We also found that junior enlisted personnel perceived more positive effects on their military careers than did the other two rank groups.

#### During-Deployment Attitudes

Although there were no component differences on organizational commitment before deployment, AC soldiers were significantly higher than RC soldiers on both affective and continuance commitment during deployment. These significantly higher means indicate that the AC soldiers, at that point in time, were both more strongly attached emotionally to the military than were the RC soldiers and that they viewed the costs of leaving the military as higher than did their RC counterparts. Since this result differs from the before-deployment finding of no RC-AC difference in commitment, we speculate that deployment events may have been more negatively perceived by RC than AC personnel.

Affective commitment dropped from before to during deployment, but the change was not great. Feelings about being in the Sinai, on the other hand, dropped precipitously. Ratings on this variable went from a very highly positive level to barely neutral. The sharpest declines on this variable occurred for the enlisted groups. Officers' scores dropped, but not as much, and officers were significantly more positive about being in the Sinai than were the other rank groups.

Although officer ratings of military job satisfaction were significantly higher than those of the NCOs and junior enlisted personnel, the differences were not great. We believe that this finding probably represents the usual more positive attitudes on the part of officers. We did not have previous data on job

satisfaction, but we suspect that job satisfaction--like other positive attitudes--dropped from before the deployment to during the deployment.

#### During-Deployment Career and Education Effects

There was a shift in career intent patterns from before the deployment to during deployment. In general, soldiers became less interested in staying in the Army until or beyond 20 years; and more soldiers felt they would separate before 20 years. This pattern was observed for all groups. If this finding is related to the deployment experience, it may reflect unmet expectations or disillusionment with the Army and/or the deployment. Data from interviews or comments may shed some light on the reasons for such results.

Although the career intent pattern seemed similar across groups, the item asking if the deployment was good for careers demonstrated differences between components. Repeating the original pattern, RC soldiers clearly considered the deployment better for their military careers than did the AC soldiers at this later point in time. However, RC and AC careers differ. For almost all RC soldiers, reserve duty involves a part-time job. Participating in the Sinai deployment would increase service time and its corresponding rewards. For AC soldiers, service in the Regular Army involves not only a full-time job but also, in many cases, a career as well. Hence AC soldiers' views of the effect of a six-month deployment may vary from those of their RC counterparts. Thus we feel that differences on this item probably reflect differences in the two types of careers.

Although the Army did not link the Sinai deployment experience to enhancing RC soldiers' chances of getting into the Regular Army, many respondents (especially RC and junior enlisted personnel) thought that it would do so. This finding suggests that RC soldiers may have done some wishful thinking about future Army careers in the Regular Army--or, alternatively--that they interpreted the information they received about the deployment in this manner. There also exists the possibility that some soldiers were deliberately misled about the benefits of volunteering for the deployment.

Overall, and across all groups, somewhat fewer soldiers reported that they had traveled outside the Sinai and many fewer soldiers reported taking courses than we would have expected from the before-deployment data. This result may reflect unrealistic expectations on the part of the soldiers about the opportunities for such activities. Or, changed circumstances may have led the Army to curtail such opportunities. Again, survey comments and data from interviews with soldiers and leaders may help to explain this finding.

## Summary and Conclusions

The pattern of responses from soldiers during the deployment was generally similar to the pattern found before deployment. However, means for all soldiers and for all subgroups dropped on most variables from before the deployment to during the deployment, indicating less positive attitudes at the latter point in time. We found substantial declines during this period on the variables of willingness to volunteer for future similar missions, benefit to military career, improvement in physical health, and willingness to stay in the Army. The steepest decline occurred in how soldiers felt about being in the Sinai. This attitude, which was highly positive before deployment, dropped very sharply to a barely neutral point during deployment. We also found the actual taking of courses for credit fell far below the level soldiers had expected before deployment.

As we found in the pattern of before-deployment results, officers tended to be somewhat more favorable and optimistic about the Army and their careers than did enlisted personnel. The frequently more positive perceptions of RC personnel that we found before deployment, however, were somewhat moderated by the time of this later data collection.

We believe that unrealistic expectations on the part of soldiers and/or the Army may be responsible for the more negative results obtained during deployment. Perhaps we can clarify this issue with data collected in follow-up research.

Table 1

## During-Deployment Effects for All Soldiers by Component

Aspects	All soldiers			Reserve Component			Active Component			Differences <sup>b</sup>
	N	Mean	(SD) <sup>a</sup>	N	Mean	(SD) <sup>a</sup>	N	Mean	(SD) <sup>a</sup>	
Physical health	422	3.58	(1.03)	293	3.67	(1.02)	70	3.30	(1.07)	R>A
Emotional well-being	397	3.82	(.92)	269	3.78	(.90)	70	3.84	(.90)	R=A
Civilian job/career	330	2.50	(1.09)	269	2.46	(1.10)	17	2.94	(.66)	R=A
Military career	419	3.47	(1.08)	290	3.63	(1.05)	70	2.91	(1.05)	R>A ( $p < .0001$ )
Marriage	346	3.03	(1.21)	234	3.09	(1.19)	60	3.07	(1.21)	R=A
Adjusting upon return	301	3.33	(1.19)	204	3.24	(1.20)	53	3.62	(1.21)	A>R
Children	233	3.06	(1.04)	152	3.01	(1.02)	41	3.22	(1.11)	R=A
Volunteering in future	414	2.63	(1.41)	288	2.81	(1.39)	67	1.99	(1.33)	R>A ( $p < .0001$ )
Willingness to stay in Army	411	3.12	(1.21)	293	3.19	(1.24)	62	2.82	(1.12)	R>A

<sup>a</sup>Rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = very negative effect to 5 = very positive effect.

<sup>b</sup>The sum of R and A soldiers does not equal the total because some soldiers did not identify their component.

Table 2

## During-Deployment Effects by Rank

Aspects	Rank									
	Junior enlisted					Officers				
	N	Mean (SD) <sup>a</sup>	N	Mean (SD) <sup>a</sup>	N	Mean (SD) <sup>a</sup>	N	Mean (SD) <sup>a</sup>	Differences <sup>b</sup>	
Physical health	232	3.63 (1.00)	130	3.51 (.99)	27	3.52 (1.34)			J=NCO=O	
Emotional well-being	215	3.82 (.93)	127	3.80 (.92)	25	3.76 (.83)			J=NCO=O	
Civilian job/career	208	2.47 (1.14)	79	2.49 (1.01)	14	2.64 (1.28)			J=NCO=O	
Military career	227	3.67 (1.00)	131	3.13 (1.11)	27	3.56 (1.15)			J>NCO&O	
Marriage	189	3.14 (1.23)	108	2.94 (1.15)	20	2.80 (1.20)			J=NCO=O	
Adjusting quickly upon return	159	3.14 (1.16)	100	3.53 (1.16)	16	4.19 (1.05)			O&NCO>J	
Children	117	3.08 (1.06)	81	3.05 (1.00)	10	3.00 (1.41)			J=NCO=O	
Volunteering in future	227	2.77 (1.36)	129	2.36 (1.37)	25	2.76 (1.51)			J>NCO	
Willingness to stay in the Army	230	3.20 (1.18)	122	2.98 (1.19)	25	3.48 (1.08)			J=O=NCO	

<sup>a</sup>Rated on a five-point scale ranging from very negative effect to very positive effect.  
<sup>b</sup>J=Junior enlisted; N=NCOs; O=Officers. Differences significant at  $p < .05$ .

Table 3

## During-Deployment Attitudes for All Soldiers and by Component

Attitude	Component			Active			Differences			
	All soldiers	Reserve								
Affective commitment	423	3.05	.70	294	3.00	.74	71	3.19	.53	A>R
Continuance commitment	423	2.51	.86	292	2.44	.85	71	2.68	.83	A>R
Civilian job satisfaction	306	3.24	1.27	258	3.22	1.26	6	4.00	.63	A=R
Military job satisfaction	424	3.04	1.28	293	3.04	1.32	71	3.04	1.21	A=R
How feel about Sinai deployment	425	3.01	1.27	294	3.06	1.32	71	2.80	1.18	A=R

Table 4

## During-Deployment Attitudes by Rank

Attitude	Component						Differences		
	Junior Enlisted		NCOS		Officers				
	N	Mean	(SD)	N	Mean	(SD)	N	Mean	(SD)
Affective commitment	231	2.93	.68	131	3.16	.66	27	3.48	.72
Continuance commitment	230	2.44	.86	132	2.63	.87	27	2.36	.80
Civilian job satisfaction	198	3.28	1.24	67	3.18	1.32	12	2.75	1.28
Military job satisfaction	231	2.97	1.29	132	2.95	1.27	27	3.81	1.18
How feel about Sinai deployment	232	2.94	1.20	132	2.93	1.38	27	3.89	1.05

Table 5

## During-Deployment Career and Education by Component

	All soldiers	Component	
		Active	Reserve
Career intent			
Stay until/beyond 20 years	44.7	52.1	42.9
Undecided	34.1	26.8	34.7
Retire before 20 years	21.2	21.1	22.4
Deployment good for career			
Yes	55.8	29.2	62.9
No	20.0	43.1	14.4
Not sure	24.3	27.7	22.7
Effect of deployment on joining RA			
No effect on RC getting into RA	10.5	11.9	10.0
Increases chances of RC getting into RA	19.4	11.9	21.6
Definitely let RC into RA	14.1	7.5	15.5
Didn't know effect for RC	56.0	68.7	52.9
Taking courses during deployment			
Yes	53.3	47.1	55.0
No	46.7	52.9	45.0
Traveling during deployment			
Yes	88.1	79.7	90.6
No	11.9	20.3	9.4

Table 6

## During-Deployment Career and Education Effects by Rank

		Rank		
		Junior enlisted	NCOS	Officers
Career intent				
Stay until/beyond 20 years		37.1	56.8	51.9
Undecided		40.1	25.8	29.6
Retire before 20 years		22.8	17.4	18.5
Deployment good for career				
Yes		63.6	40.8	46.2
No		15.0	30.8	11.5
Not sure		21.4	28.3	42.3
Effect of deployment on joining RA				
No effect on RC getting into RA		6.6	10.2	29.6
Increases chances of RC getting into RA		22.7	16.4	11.1
Definitely let RC into RA		16.2	11.7	3.7
Didn't know effect for RC		54.6	61.7	55.6
Taking courses during deployment				
Yes		53.6	57.9	18.5
No		46.4	42.1	81.5
Traveling during deployment				
Yes		87.6	86.7	96.3
No		12.4	13.3	3.7

### References

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1-18.

Card, J. J. (1983). Lives after Vietnam: The personal impact of military service. Toronto: Lexington.

Ivie, R. L., Gimbel, C., & Elder, Jr. (1991). Military experience and attitudes in later life: Contextual influence across forty years. Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 19, 101-117.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side bet" theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 69, 372-378.

Oliver, L.W., Tiggle, R.B., & Hayes, S.M. (in press). Preliminary report on selected life course variables and reasons for volunteering for the 28th Sinai deployment. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute.

Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (Eds.). (1982). Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice. New York: Wiley.

Teplitzky, M. L. (1991). Junior Army officer retention intentions: A path analytic model. (ARI Technical Report 934). Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute.

## APPENDIX A

### Decision Rules for Mismarked Answer Sheets and Social Security Number Conflicts

#### Answer Sheets

Our decision rule was the following: If the respondent used the same response category for the organizational commitment items (Nos. 6-20 on page 2 of the survey) and the same response category for the effects items (Nos. 24-32 on page 3 of the survey), the responses were not included in our data analyses.

The response categories for the two variable sets could be different (e.g., "A" for the commitment items and "B" for the effects items), but the responses had to fall in the same category within each variable set. Given the nature of the items in each set, it was our judgement that no one exercising even a modicum of care in completing the questionnaire would have answered them all the same.

#### Social Security Numbers

There were three sources for a subject's social security number (SSN): a master list of names and SSNs provided by the Army, the SSN (and name) collected on the before-deployment survey (fall of 1994), and the SSN on the during-deployment survey (spring 1995). Our decision rules were:

1. If the respondent used the same SSN in both data collections (fall 1994 and spring 1995), that was the SSN assigned to the subject, even if it differed from the master list.
2. If different SSNs were used for fall 1994 and spring 1995, but one matched the master list, we assigned the SSN on the master list.

These decision rules enabled us to assign SSNs to all subjects except one for whom we had three different SSNs. We have retained the data under the three SSNs, and we will review the situation after the mail survey tentatively planned for the fall of 1995.

OPINIONS ABOUT THE SINAI DEPLOYMENT

May 1995

This notification is to inform you of who is conducting this survey and what use will be made of the information being collected, in accordance with Public Law 93-573, the Privacy Act of 1974. This survey was compiled and is being administered by personnel of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, headquartered at Alexandria, Virginia, as a part of a research project on peacekeeping. This research is authorized by Acts of Congress which authorize recruitment and maintenance of military forces and authorize research to accomplish this goal. This authority is in Title 10, United States Code, Sections 503 and 2358. The use of Social Security numbers is authorized by Executive Order 9397. Survey participation is voluntary. Information on individuals is confidential and will not be used by or released to anyone. Information on groups of soldiers will be used only for research and policy analysis.

**DIRECTIONS**

\* PLEASE COMPLETE THESE SECTIONS AT THE TOP OF THE BLUE ANSWER  
\* SHEET NOW:

\* (Today's) DATE  
\* SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

\* GRADE  
\* SEX

\* NOW TURN TO PAGE 1 OF THE SURVEY AND BEGIN WITH QUESTION 1.  
\* PLEASE FOLLOW THE NUMBERS CAREFULLY.

This survey asks your opinions about various aspects of the Sinai deployment.

1. Which of the following best describes your career in the military?
  - (A) I have been in the military for 20 or more creditable years, and I plan to retire as soon as possible.
  - (B) I plan to stay in the military beyond 20 creditable years.
  - (C) I plan to stay in the military until retirement at 20 creditable years.
  - (D) I am undecided about staying in the military until retirement.
  - (E) I will probably leave the military before retirement.
  - (F) I will definitely leave the military before retirement.
2. All in all, I am satisfied with my military job in the Sinai.
  - (A) Strongly disagree
  - (B) Disagree
  - (C) Neither agree nor disagree
  - (D) Agree
  - (E) Strongly agree
3. All in all, I was satisfied with the civilian job I had before this deployment.
  - (A) Strongly disagree
  - (B) Disagree
  - (C) Neither agree nor disagree
  - (D) Agree
  - (E) Strongly agree
  - (F) Does not apply--I did not have a civilian job.
4. Have you traveled or are you planning to travel outside the Sinai for recreation (e.g., in Egypt or Israel) during this deployment?
  - (A) Yes
  - (B) No
5. Have you taken courses or are you taking courses for credit during this deployment?
  - (A) Yes
  - (B) No

Please use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. The term "military" in each statement refers to your own military component (Army National Guard, US Army Reserve, or Regular Army.)

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I really feel as if the problems of the military are my own.
7. One of the major reasons I may stay in the military is that another organization may not match the overall benefits I have.
8. I feel like "part of the family" in the military.
9. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving the military.
10. The military has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
11. It would be too costly for me to leave the military in the near future.
12. I am afraid of what might happen if I quit the military without having another job lined up.
13. It would be very hard for me to leave the military now even if I wanted to.
14. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the military now.
15. I feel a strong sense of belonging to the military.
16. Right now, staying with the military is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
17. I feel "emotionally attached" to the military.
18. One of the negative consequences of leaving the military would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
19. I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to the military.
20. I enjoy discussing the military with people outside it.

21. How do you feel about being in the Sinai?

- (A) Very negative
- (B) Somewhat negative
- (C) Neutral
- (D) Somewhat positive
- (E) Very positive

22. Do you think that this mission will be good for your Army career?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No
- (C) Not sure
- (D) Does not apply--I will leave the Army within the next year.

23. It was my understanding that going on the Sinai deployment would ...

- (A) have no effect on RC soldiers' chances of getting into the Regular Army.
- (B) increase RC soldiers' chances of getting into the Regular Army.
- (C) definitely let RC soldiers get into the Regular Army if they wanted to do so.
- (D) Didn't know what effect it would have for RC soldiers.

Please indicate how you believe your deployment to the Sinai is affecting various aspects of your life now. Use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with EACH of the following statements:

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Does Not Apply

24. My physical health is improving.

25. My emotional well-being is improving.

26. My civilian job/career is benefiting.

27. My military career is benefiting.

28. My marriage or other significant relationship is suffering.

29. My spouse and I will quickly adjust to each other when I return.

30. My children are being negatively affected.

31. I am more likely to volunteer for similar future operations.

32. I am more willing to stay in the Army National Guard/US Army Reserve/Regular Army.

Attitudes Towards Roles and Missions

**A. Role of the U.S. Military**

For the following items, respond using this scale:

A = Very unlikely  
B = Somewhat unlikely  
C = Somewhat likely  
D = Very likely

What do you think is the likelihood that the United States will be involved in each of the following kinds of deployments within the next ten years?

33. Peacekeeping force
34. Guerilla war
35. Limited conventional war
36. Large conventional war
37. Tactical nuclear war
38. A war in which tactical chemical weapons are used
39. A war in which tactical biological weapons are used
40. Strategic nuclear war
41. Humanitarian assistance after a U.S. domestic disaster
42. Restoration of order after a U.S. domestic disturbance or riot
43. Overseas humanitarian assistance

## B. Attitudes Toward Peacekeeping

Use this scale to respond to the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5
: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____
(A) strongly disagree	(B) disagree	(C) neither agree nor disagree	(D) agree	(E) strongly agree

44. A soldier who is well-trained in basic military skills requires additional training for peacekeeping.
45. Soldiers can be effective in a peacekeeping role even if they cannot use force except in self-defense.
46. Peacekeeping duty is boring.
47. A peacekeeping force should be impartial in a conflict situation.
48. Soldiers on peacekeeping duty should be unarmed.
49. The primary goal of peacekeepers is to contain or reduce conflict without the use of force.
50. Peacekeeping operations are appropriate missions for my unit.
51. Peacekeeping assignments help a soldier's career.
52. Peacekeeping operations are hardest on soldiers with families.
53. A professional soldier is able to perform peacekeeping missions and war-fighting missions equally effectively.
54. Peacekeeping missions should be performed by civilians rather than by soldiers.
55. Peacekeeping missions should be performed by military police rather than by infantry.
56. Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as regular military personnel.

### C. Adjustment to Multinational Operations

Use this scale to respond to the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5
: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____
(A) strongly disagree	(B) disagree	(C) neither agree nor disagree	(D) agree	(E) strongly agree

57. It's much more difficult to work with foreign nationals than with people from the United States.
58. You can trust foreign nationals as much as you can trust people from the United States.
59. Most people from most countries are pretty much alike.
60. I like to travel.
61. I look forward to new experiences.
62. I like to try foreign foods.

### USE OF TNET (TELETRAINING NETWORK)

63. During this rotation, did you take any courses using TNET?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No (If you answer No, skip questions 64-67.)
64. Which course(s) did you take? (Mark all that apply.)
  - A. PLDC (Primary Leadership Development Course)
  - B. IOAC (Infantry Officer Advanced Course)
  - C. Arab language course
  - D. Other

65. If you have a chance, would you like to take some more courses using TNET after this rotation?

A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure

66. Did you give up personal or other time to take a TNET course?

A. Yes  
B. No (If you answer No, skip question 67.)

67. What did you take time away from in order to take the TNET course? (Mark all that apply.)

A. QRF (Quick Reaction Force)  
B. R&R/Tours  
C. National Training  
D. Remote Site

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

PLEASE ADD ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH TO MAKE  
ON THE SEPARATE SHEET PROVIDED